IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BRITTANY VELEZ	:
4731 Edmund St.	:

Philadelphia, PA 19124 : CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff, : No. _____

v.

MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION PROVIDERS, LLC

823 W. Erie Ave

Philadelphia, PA 19140

and

OMAR CARRILLO

c/o Medical Transportation Providers

823 W. Erie Ave

Philadelphia, PA 19140

Defendants.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, by and through her undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

1. This action has been initiated by Brittany Velez (*hereinafter* referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise) to redress violations by Medical Transportation Providers, LLC and Omar Carrillo (*hereinafter* collectively referred to as "Defendants," unless indicated otherwise) of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA" - 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et. seq.*) and applicable state law(s).

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This action is initiated pursuant to a federal law. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action

pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the claims arise under the laws of the United States. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims because they arise out of the same circumstances and are based upon a common nucleus of operative fact.

- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants' contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendants to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in <u>International Shoe Co. v. Washington</u>, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (1), venue is properly laid in this district because Defendants are residents of this district.

III. PARTIES

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 7. Defendant Medical Transportation Providers, LLC (*hereinafter* referred to as "Defendant Entity") is a business entity that provides transportation for clients to and from medical appointments.
- 8. Defendant, Omar Carrillo (*hereinafter* referred to as "Defendant Carrillo"), is the owner of Defendant Entity who controls and manages the terms and conditions of employment for employees (including Plaintiff), including but not limited to hiring, firing, issuing discipline, and compensation.

9. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through their agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 10. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 11. Plaintiff was hired by Defendants on or about December 9, 2019.
- 12. Plaintiff was employed with Defendants as a Driver throughout her tenure until her unlawful termination on July 28, 2021.
- 13. Plaintiff's job duties consisted of picking up clients within the city of Philadelphia from their home, driving them to their doctor's appointment (located in Philadelphia), and then taking them back home.
- 14. Throughout her employment with Defendants, Plaintiff would drive Defendants' vehicles, which consisted of sedans and vans.
- 15. During her employment with Defendants, Plaintiff would work well over 40 hours per week on a consistent basis.
- 16. In the beginning of her employment, Plaintiff often times work 10-11 hour days, six (6) days a week.
- 17. Towards the end of her employment, Plaintiff began working five (5) days a week; however, she was still working 10-11 hour days.
- 18. Throughout her tenure with Defendants, Defendants committed numerous wage and hour violations under state and federal law. For example, but not intending to be an exhaustive list:

3

- i. Plaintiff was given various and different explanations regarding her rate of pay throughout her employment with Defendants. For example, at one point, Plaintiff was told by Defendant Carrillo (and some of her paychecks reflect) that she was an hourly employee. However, when Plaintiff questioned why she was not being paid for all hours that she worked, Defendant Carrillo informed her that she was being paid a "\$5.00 commission per ride." On another occasion, Plaintiff was informed that she was paid a "daily rate;"
- ii. There were several occasions when Plaintiff was paid in cash (without any explanation from Defendants regarding how they calculated her wages) and her paystub for those weeks would reflect that she worked 0 hours and was paid \$0.00 in certain weeks;
- iii. There was also several occasions that Plaintiff would be paid for some hours in the form of a paystub (indicating that she worked approximately 20 hours) and then the remainder of her wages in cash (with again no explanation regarding how Defendants calculated her wages);
- iv. Starting in or about October of 2020 through in or about July of 2021, Plaintiff was being paid through Defendant Entity's payroll system on a consistent basis; however, Defendants would categorize all of her pay as "commission" and the amounts would vary from week to week;
- v. As discussed *supra*, Defendants would consistently change Plaintiff's pay rate/structure, but would never inform her when it was changing and never provided any clear explanation as to how she was being paid for her work;

- vi. Despite consistently working overtime hours, Defendants never paid Plaintiff time and one half for any hours that she worked over 40 in one week. Even when Plaintiff's paystubs did reflect that she was being paid by the hour, Plaintiff was only paid for 60 hours over the course of two-weeks, when she in fact worked well over 80 hours during such pay periods; and
- vii. In addition to not paying Plaintiff overtime compensation for hours worked over 40 hours in one week, Defendants would also consistently not pay Plaintiff for all other hours worked.
- 19. Towards the end of her employment with Defendants, Plaintiff made several complaints to Defendant Carrillo regarding Defendants illegal pay practices, failure to properly pay Plaintiff for all hours that she worked; and failure to pay her overtime compensation for hours that she worked beyond 40 in one week.
- 20. Defendant Carrillo's response to Plaintiff's complaints about Defendants' violations of state and federal wage and hour laws (including failure to pay overtime compensation) was typically, "if you don't like it here, you can leave," or "I will gladly write you a letter of recommendation if you want to leave."
- 21. Defendants clearly displayed animosity toward Plaintiff and her complaints of Defendants' illegal pay practices, and as a result abruptly terminated her employment on or about July 28, 2021 for completely pretextual reasons, including allegedly ignoring company rules.
- 22. In connection with her termination, Defendants offered Plaintiff an unsolicited Separation Agreement and General Release, which required that Plaintiff waive any and all

5

claims against Defendants and affirm that she "has been paid all compensation due to her because of her employment relationship with the Employer" in exchange for a small sum of money. Plaintiff rejected this proposed offer.

- 23. Defendants have setup and perpetrated a system whereby they have deceived Plaintiff and intentionally failed to abide by overtime laws and as a result, Plaintiff is owed unpaid wages.
- 24. As the aforementioned evidence clearly demonstrates that these violations were willful, Plaintiff seeks all wages she was owed going back three (3) years from the date of this complaint.

Count I <u>Violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA")</u> (Overtime and Minimum Wage Violations) - Against Both Defendants -

- 25. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 26. At all times relevant herein, Defendants have and continue to be employers within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §203 ("FLSA").
- 27. At all times relevant herein, Defendants to this Action were responsible for paying wages to Plaintiff.
- 28. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was employed with Defendants as an "employee" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 29. The FLSA requires covered employers, such as Defendants, to minimally compensate its "non-exempt" employees, such as Plaintiff, 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for each hour that the employee works over 40 in a workweek.

6

30. At all times during her employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was a "non-exempt" employee within the meaning of the FLSA.

31. Plaintiff worked in excess of 40 hours per week nearly every week she worked for Defendants.

32. Plaintiff was not properly paid for all hours that she worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

33. Plaintiff therefore seeks all remedies permitted under the FLSA for unpaid wages, as well as penalties and interest.

34. Defendant Carrillo is personally liable because he was the owner of Defendant Entity and was responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiff including but not limited to her compensation. Defendant Carrillo was also responsible for perpetuating company-wide unlawful payroll practices and ratifying same. Additionally, Defendant Carrillo personally and intentionally deceived Plaintiff regarding her compensation.

Count II <u>Violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA")</u> (Unlawful Retaliation - Wrongful Termination) -Against Both Defendants-

- 35. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 36. Following Plaintiff's complaints of Defendants' illegal pay practices (including failure to pay overtime compensation), Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment for completely pretextual reasons.
- 37. Defendant Carrillo is personally liable because he was the owner of Defendant Entity and was responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiff including

but not limited to her compensation and termination. Additionally, Defendant Carrillo personally participated in and carried out the retaliatory actions asserted herein.

Count III

Violations of the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act ("PMWA") (Overtime and Minimum Wage Violations) - Against Both Defendants -

- 38. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 39. Defendants' failure to pay overtime in the aforesaid manners also constitutes a violation of the PMWA.
- 40. Defendant Carrillo is personally liable because he was the owner of Defendant Entity and was responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiff including but not limited to her compensation. Defendant Carrillo was also responsible for perpetuating company-wide unlawful payroll practices and ratifying same. Additionally, Defendant Carrillo personally and intentionally deceived Plaintiff regarding her compensation.

Count III

Violation of the Pennsylvania Wage Payment Collection Law ("WPCL") (43 P.S. 260.3(a)-(b)) - Against Both Defendants -

- 41. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 42. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff for all wages owed and hours worked during her employment.
- 43. Plaintiff performed the services for Defendants as instructed by Defendants, but Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff for the services rendered.

- 44. Defendant Carrillo is personally liable because he was the owner of Defendant Entity and was responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiff including but not limited to her compensation. Defendant Carrillo was also responsible for perpetuating company-wide unlawful payroll practices and ratifying same. Additionally, Defendant Carrillo personally and intentionally deceived Plaintiff regarding her compensation.
- 45. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the Pennsylvania Wage Payment and Collection Law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendants are to promulgate and adhere to a policy prohibiting payroll violations.
- B. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' wrongful actions, including but not limited to past lost earnings and wages, back pay, front pay, salary, pay increases, and bonuses.
- C. Plaintiff is to be awarded actual damages, as well as damages for the pain, suffering, and humiliation caused by Defendants' actions;
- D. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive and/or liquidated damages as permitted by applicable law in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for their willful, deliberate, malicious, and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendants or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- E. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper, and appropriate;

- F. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and a reasonable attorney's fees if permitted by applicable law; and
 - G. Plaintiff is permitted to have a trial by jury.

Dated: October 29, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

Ari R. Karpf, Esquire 3331 Street Road Building 2, Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Telephone	FAX Num	ber	E-Mail Address	
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-49	70	akarpf@karpf-law.com	***************************************
Date	Attorney-a	t-law	Attorney for	
10/29/2021		>	Plaintiff	
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not	t fall into	any one of the other tracks.	(X)
the court. (See reverse s management cases.)	complex and tha ide of this form f	t need spe or a detail	ecial or intense management by led explanation of special	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ing claims for per	rsonal injv	ury or property damage from	()
,			bitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
and Human Services den	ying plaintiff So	cial Secur	•	()
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases I			e e	()
SELECT ONE OF THE FO		<		
plaintiff shall complete a Car filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant s the plaintiff and all other par to which that defendant belief	se Management 1 e a copy on all deferent that a deference shall, with its first rties, a Case Manaeves the case show	Frack Des fendants. Idant does t appearant agement I uld be ass		me of
Medical Transportation Provid		:	NO.	
v.		:		
Brittany Velez	. :		CIVIL ACTION	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:21-cv-04767-JDWed Squiresquistric iledul (29/21 Page 12 of 13 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 4731 Edmund Street, Philadelphia, PA 19124	j ine case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate catendar)			
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of bu				
Trace of Accident, includent of Transaction. <u>Berendants place of ou</u>	IIIC55			
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:				
Case Number: Judge:	Date Terminated:			
Civil cases are deemed related when <i>Yes</i> is answered to any of the followin	g questions:			
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pen- previously terminated action in this court?	ing or within one year Yes No X			
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No X				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated actions.				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appearase filed by the same individual?	or pro se civil rights Yes No X			
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is is not relate this court except as noted above.	to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in			
DATE: 10/29/2021	ARK2484 / 91538			
Attornley-at-1	aw / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)			
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)				
CIVIL: (Place a $$ in one category only) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:			
	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is to	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is to	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): CION CERTIFICATION			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is to the second or prossure of the	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TON CERTIFICATION remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is to exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs: Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TON CERTIFICATION remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)			

Case 2:21-cv-04767-JDW_Document 1_Filed 10/29/21 Page 13 of 13 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. except as

provided by local rules of court purpose of initiating the civil do	. This form, approved by the ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	e Judicial Conference of the TONS ON NEXT PAGE OF T	ne United States in September 19' THIS FORM.)	74, is required for the use of the	e Clerk of Court for the		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS			
VELEZ, BRITTANY			MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION PROVIDERS, LLC, ET AL.				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address, and Telephone Number)	1	Attorneys (If Known)				
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, l Suite 128, Bensalem, PA	P.C.; 3331 Street Road	l, Two Greenwood S					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI 1 U.S. Government	X 3 Federal Question		II. CITIZENSHIP OF PI (For Diversity Cases Only) PI	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF		
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government N	lot a Party)	Citizen of This State	1 Incorporated or Princ of Business In T			
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 2 Incorporated <i>and</i> Pri of Business In A			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	6 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		(y) RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature o BANKRUPTCY	f Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES		
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 1367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	G25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 G90 Other LABOR X 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act F90 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application M65 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal	□ 375 False Claims Act ' 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
	moved from atte Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	Reopened Anothe (specify,				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON FLSA (29USC20) Brief description of cau	1)	filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statu	tes unless diversity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN	_	FLSA and applicabl IS A CLASS ACTION	e state law(s). DEMAND\$	CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:		
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 23	3, F.R.Cv.P.		JURY DEMAND:	X Yes 'No		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 10/29/2021		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	PRNEY OF RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							

Print

AMOUNT

RECEIPT#

Save As...

APPLYING IFP

MAG. JUDGE

JUDGE